REMARKS

The office action of December 18, 2006 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1 through 4 and 6 through 19 remain in this case, claims 1, 4, 6, and 8 being amended and claim 5 being cancelled by this response.

Preliminary Comments

The numbered paragraphs below correspond to the numbered paragraphs in the Office Action.

The claims were amended as follows, to correct typographical errors and other informalities. No new matter was introduced. Specifically:

a. Claim 4 was amended to change the limitation "sub-image" to "cell image" this amendment is supported by the language used in parent claim 1 as filed. No new matter has been added.

b. Claim 5 has been cancelled and rewritten in independent form as claim 1.

b. Claims 6 and 8 have been amended to depend on amended independent claim 1 instead of cancelled claim 5.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

2. The Examiner rejected claim 4 as being indefinite because the limitation "sub-image" appearing therein lacked proper antecedent basis.

The limitation has been amended to "cell image" which is consistent with the terminology of the parent claim. Applicant believes that these amendments have fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, and the claims are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

5. Claims 1-3 and 10-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanko *et al.* (US 6,493,041). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Claim 5 has been incorporated into claim 1. The Examiner stated that claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Such action has been taken.

Therefore, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection of independent claim 1 as being anticipated by Hanko *et al.* (US 6,493,041) is overcome. Dependent claims 2-3 and 10-19, being dependent upon and further limiting independent claim 1, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 5-9 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Such action has been taken, as noted in the preliminary comments above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:
-- Om P. Gupta *et al*. --

By:_____/KLH #57457/_____
-- Kraig Haverstick, Reg. No. 57,457 --
Agent for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com
Dated: May 17, 2007